



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,393	12/27/2000	Hiroshi Minagawa	SIP1P044	7511
22434 7:	590 06/02/2003			
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, C	CA 94704-0778		MCCARTNEY, LINZY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2671	10
			DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



•	_		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
· Advisory Action	09/751,393	MINAGAWA ET AL.	
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Linzy McCartney	2671	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE THEORY FILED 05 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THEORY FILED THEORY FILED 15 THEORY FIL	avoid abandonment of this a (1) a timely filed amendment	pplication. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in	
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The drave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth han SIX MONTHS from the mailing of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS Of ate on which the petition under 37 CF insion and the corresponding amount at statutory period for reply originally set.	late of the final rejection. F THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	because:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require furth	her consideration and/or sea	rch (see NOTE below);	
(b) $\square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding numbe	r of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		considered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v	nt(s) a)□ will not be entered would be rejected is provided	or b)∏ will be entered and an I below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	<b>S</b> :		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_		
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on i			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No	(s)	
10. Other:	70	harle June	
		SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER	
S. Patent and Trademark Office		TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600	





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the cited art fails to teach or suggest duplicating an object. However, Streetfighter Collection clearly shows the same object (a fighter) being duplicated. The dummy object disclosed in Streetfighter Collection is an image of the fighter at a previous time frame, which makes the dummy object a duplicate of the figher at that moment in time. The Examiner notes that the claims are silent with regard to the orienation and timing of the duplicate object; the claims merely state the object is duplicated. Regarding the Applicant's argument that Streetfighter Collection fails to teach drawing the duplicate object in a higher lighteness, the screenshot on page 3 clearly shows the the dummy object being drawn in a higher lightness.